

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the Final Office Action. This paper is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection and objection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1–6 and 8–27 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 5, 12–22 and 24–25 have been amended.

No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claims 13, 14, 20, and 25 because of alleged informalities in these claims.

Applicants have amended claims 14, 20, and 25 according to the corrections suggested in the Office Action, in order to correct the alleged informalities.

With regard to claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 13 is proper and does not raise any informalities that require correction.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 13, 14, 20, and 25 because of alleged informalities be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1–6 and 8–20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne et al., United States Patent Number 6,259,682 (“Brown”) in view of Ngai et al., United States Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0003793 (“Ngai”).

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, and without conceding that the combination renders claims 1–6 and 8–20 obvious, Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, the rejection of claims 1–6

and 8-20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Ngai should be withdrawn.

Each one of amended independent claims 1 and 15 recites in paraphrase, *inter alia*, a repeater having a downlink section and an uplink section, wherein at least one of these sections is able to perform the operations of sampling traffic load characteristics, adjusting gain in that section, and sustaining the output power level of that section. Browne and/or Ngai, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least this feature of amended independent claims 1 and 15. Therefore, Browne and/or Ngai, alone or in combination, do not render amended independent claims 1 and 15 obvious.

It is noted that Browne and/or Ngai describe, at most, power adjustment in an uplink section based on signal processing performed in the downlink section (see Browne, Figure 2 and the text corresponding thereto). The power adjustment of Browne and/or Ngai is thus fundamentally different from the output power level sustaining of claims 1 and 15, which includes sustaining of output power level of an uplink section of a repeater based on operations performed in the uplink section, or sustaining of output power level of a downlink section of a repeater based on operations performed in the downlink section.

Claims 2-6 and 8-14, and claims 16-20, are dependent from amended independent claims 1 and 15, respectively, and include all the features of these independent claims as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the novelty and patentability of claims 2-6 and 8-14, and claims 16-20, follow directly from the novelty and patentability of amended independent claims 1 and 15, respectively.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Ngai be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 21-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun et al., United States Patent Number 6,374,119 (“Jun”) in view of Ngai.

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, and without conceding that the combination renders claims 21-27 obvious, Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, the rejection of claims 21-27 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun in view of Ngai should be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 21 recites in paraphrase, *inter alia*, a repeater having a downlink section and an uplink section, wherein at least one of these sections is able to perform the operations of sampling traffic load characteristics, adjusting gain in that section, and sustaining the output power level of that section. Jun and/or Ngai, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least this feature of amended independent claim 21. Therefore, Jun and/or Ngai, alone or in combination, do not render amended independent claim 21 obvious.

It is noted that Jun and/or Ngai describe, at most, power control based on external control signals (“first variable attenuator 1240 performing power control … according to external control signals”; Jun, column 5), or power control based on a processed signal from another section (“second variable attenuator 1310 performing power control according to control signals of the microprocessor 1500”; Jun, column 5). The power control of Jun and/or Ngai is thus fundamentally different from the output power level sustaining of claim 21, which includes sustaining of output power level of an uplink section of a repeater based on operations performed in the uplink section, or sustaining of output power level of a downlink section of a repeater based on operations performed in the downlink section.

Claims 22-27 are dependent from amended independent claim 21, and include all the features of this independent claim as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the novelty and patentability of claims 22-27 follow directly from the novelty and patentability of amended independent claim 21.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 21-27 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jun in view of Ngai be withdrawn.

Applicants: MEIR, Amir *et al.*
Serial Number: 10/562,808
Page 10

Attorney Docket: P-5997-US

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims distinguish over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue are therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to discuss any further issues yet to be resolved in connection with this application.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3400.

Respectfully submitted,

Naim Shichrur
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 56,248

Dated: June 11, 2008

EMPK & Shiloh, LLP
116 John St., Suite 1201
New York, NY 10038
Phone: (212) 608-4141
Facsimile: (212) 608-4144